

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1-7, 9, 11, 16-19, 21-25, 27, and 29-31 were rejected. Claim 21 was rejected under Section 102(b) over *Richardson* ('886). Claim 22 was rejected under Section 102(b) over *Richardson* ('961). Claims 1-7, 11, 16-18, 24, 25, 27, and 29-31 were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of *Smith* and *Richardson* ('886). Claims 16-19 were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of *Richardson* ('886) and *Smith*. And, claims 23-25 were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of *Richardson* ('961) and *Richardson* ('886). While objection was made to claims 8, 10, 12-15, 20, 26, 28, and 32-33, the Examiner indicated such claims to recite patentable subject matter. And, objection was made to various informalities in claims 1, 16, 26, and 28.

The Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of patentable subject matter in claims 8, 10, 12-15, 20, 26, 28, and 32-33. Claims 8 and 15 have been placed in independent form and, as now-presented, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 1 has been canceled, and various of the dependent claims, 2-7 and 9-14, have been amended so that all of such dependent claims are dependent, directly or indirectly, upon claim 15. These claims, accordingly, are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 23 has been amended, now to include the recitations of claim 26, indicated by the Examiner to recite allowable subject matter. While claim 26 had previously been recited to be dependent upon claim 1, the Applicants believe that none of the cited references shows apparatus including a single first filter flag and a second single filter flag in which the first filter flag is positioned between the two lenses, all as now recited, to integrate light and to provide a single color output beam.

Independent method claim 16 has been amended, now to recite a method analog to amended claim 23. For the same reasons for which claim 23 is believed to be in condition for allowance, claim 16 is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent apparatus claim 22 has been amended now further to recite a linear translation actuator corresponding to the structure recited in claim 12, indicated by the Examiner to recite patentable subject matter. As none of the references was cited by the Examiner for showing a linear translation actuator recited in claim 12, its recitation in claim 22, together with

the recitations of the first and second lenses and the filter flag is believed to place this claim in condition for allowance. And, independent claim 21 has also been amended, now further to recite that the first and second filter flags are positionable through sliding, linear translation along an axis substantially perpendicular to a light beam. The Applicants assert that neither of the *Richardson* references nor the *Smith* reference disclose such structure, recited now in claim 22, as amended.

Recitations to which objection was made in claims 16, 26, and 28 have been removed, and claims 8 and 15, as now-presented do not include the recitations to which objection was made in claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claims 8, 15, 16, 22, and 23, as now-presented, and the dependent claims dependent thereon, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

Robert H. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com